

Remarks/Arguments:

ONE MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME

A separate Petition for an Extension of Time is enclosed herewith, thereby extending the period for response to January 10, 2004 (since January 9, 2004 is a Sunday).

CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present Office Action. All claims are rejected. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-12 are amended and claims 2 and 8 are cancelled herein. No new matter is added.

REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8, are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,011,868 to van den Branden et al. (herein van den Branden). Claims 3-6 and 9-12 are rejected as unpatentable over van den Branden et al. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Amended claim 1 includes at least one feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

- a picture type detection section for, while a still picture is being reproduced, detecting a picture type of a picture, from among the plurality of pictures, corresponding to the still picture;
- a bit rate calculation section for, while the still picture is being reproduced, calculating a number of bits included in the picture corresponding to the still picture, and while a moving picture is being reproduced, calculating an average bit rate per predetermined time unit, **and selecting and outputting either the number of bits included in the picture corresponding to the still picture or the average bit rate per predetermined time unit;** and
- a video signal generation section for, while the still picture is being reproduced, generating a first bit rate video signal for displaying the picture type detected by the picture type detection section and the number of bits calculated by the bit rate calculation section, and while the moving picture is being reproduced, generating a second bit rate video signal for displaying the average bit rate calculated by the bit rate calculation section;
- a video decoder for expanding the video bit stream to generate a video signal; and

- **a video signal addition section for, while the still picture is being reproduced, adding the video signal generated by the video decoder and the first bit rate video signal generated by the video signal generation section, and while the moving picture is being reproduced, adding the video signal generated by the video decoder and the second bit rate video signal generated by the video signal generation section.**

The feature of adding the video signal generated by the video decoder to the first/second bit rate video signal generated by the video signal generation section while the still/moving picture is being reproduced has the advantage of directly displaying/superposing the picture type and video bit rate display with the video signal display such that both sets of information may be displayed simultaneously while the still or moving picture is being reproduced. This is disclosed in the specification on page 3, lines 29-33 and page 4, line 1.

The Office Action indicates that this feature is taught by van den Branden. Van den Branden discloses a device for performing bitstream quality analysis. In particular, van den Branden discloses a system whereby information concerning the monitored MPEG video elementary bitstream, as well as varying levels of quality analysis, are displayed to a user via a Graphical User Interface (GUI), as disclosed in column 5, lines 48-51. The features taught by van den Branden include a GUI that allows a user to display varying levels of quality analysis of a non-decoded, partially-decoded, or fully-decoded bitstream, depending on the desired level of quality analysis, as disclosed in column 14, lines 27-36. Further, the features taught by van den Branden include an Analysis Control Panel window that provides the user with the ability to display the motion picture represented by the video bitstream by selecting "Display Video." However, van den Branden merely teaches a feature to display the motion picture, and a feature to display varying levels of quality analysis. Van den Branden does not teach the feature of adding the quality analysis display to the motion picture display and displaying the resulting output. Thus, van den Branden differs from the claimed invention, wherein the picture type is detected, the bit rate is calculated, a video displaying the aforementioned attributes is generated, and the aforementioned video is added to a video signal generated by the video decoder.

Further to this, the claimed invention discloses the feature of selecting and outputting either the number of bits included in the pictured corresponding to the still picture or the average bit rate per predetermined time unit, as disclosed in the specification on page 19, lines 10-17. The advantage of such a feature would be understood by one skilled in the art, in that the present invention automatically selects and outputs the appropriate display depending on the video display mode; i.e., if the video is in pause mode or if the video is in play mode, then the picture type and the bit number of one picture or the average bit rate of a plurality of pictures is selected and output appropriately.

Appln. No.: 09/965,985
Amendment Dated December 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2004

YAO-4346US

The Office Action indicates that this feature is taught by van den Branden. However, as disclosed in Figure 13, van den Branden merely discloses a device whereby both the individual number of bits for a frame and the average bit rate are displayed simultaneously, regardless of the video mode. Therefore, van den Branden fails to teach or suggest this feature of the claimed invention.

Amended claim 1 is therefore novel and unobvious over the cited reference for at least the above reasons and, therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claim 7, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 7 is also patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons set forth above that claim 1 is patentable. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3-6 and 9-12 depend directly or indirectly from either claims 1 or 7, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 7 are patentable. Therefore, the rejections of claims 3-6 and 9-12 should similarly be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, the above identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel N. Calder

Daniel N. Calder, Reg. No. 27,424
Stephen J. Weed, Reg. No. 45,202
Attorneys for Applicant

SJW/lcf

Dated: December 30, 2004

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: December 30, 2004

Lorraine C. Fox

Lorraine C. Fox